

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-6 and 9-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,518,586 to Mirous (hereafter "Mirous") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,228,281 to Sage (hereafter "Sage"). Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mirous in view of Sage and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,432,482 to Jaffee et al. (hereafter "Jaffee").

Specifically, the Examiner asserts that *Mirous* generally teaches all the steps of claim 1 of the instant invention. The Examiner admits that Mirous does not disclose the composition or properties of the lubricant, and further, that Mirous does not disclose that the sized fibers have a loss on ignition between 0.01% and about 0.75%. However, the Examiner states that Sage discloses treating glass fibers with a sizing composition comprising a cationic lubricant that can be a partially amidated polyalkylene imine such as a reaction of C2 to C18 fatty acids with a polyethylene imine having a molecular weight from about 800 to about 50,000, and that the product has a residual amine value from about 200 to about 800. The Examiner states that Sage discloses that the amount of cationic lubricant is present in an amount from about 0.01% to about 0.1% by weight of the composition, and that Sage teaches that the sizing composition helps prevent breakage of fibers during handling and reduces the fuzz on the surface of the fibers. The Examiner also asserts that the sized fibers disclosed by Sage would inherently have the claimed LOI because, where the claimed and prior art apparatus or product are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established.

The Examiner concludes that the art of Mirous, Sage, and the instant invention are analogous as they pertain to the art of treating glass fibers. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the claimed sizing composition in the mat of Mirous in view of Sage to reduce the breakage of fibers and creation of fuzz on the fiber surface.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that when the glass fibers are separated by immersing the glass fibers in an aqueous dispersant medium, that aqueous dispersant medium includes an emulsifier, and that when the slurry formed is agitated, the emulsifier generates entrained air and separates the glass fibers into individual strands. Independent claim 11 has been amended similarly. Support for the amendment is found throughout the specification, and specifically, on page 5, line 27 – page 6, line 3. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by way of the amendment to the claims, and respectfully request entry of the amendment.

Mirous, on the other hand, fails to recite that the glass fibers are dispersed into an aqueous medium containing an emulsifier. The cited reference of Sage completely fails to disclose a white water slurry, and therefore agitation of the slurry that contains an emulsifier to generate entrained air. Independent claims 1 and 11, as amended, clearly recite that the aqueous dispersant includes an emulsifier to generate entrained air when the slurry is agitated. This entrained air imparts a white color to the slurry, thus making it a white water slurry. The agitation of the aqueous slurry separated the glass fibers into individual strands before the strands are dried. This ensures that during the drying step the wet glass fibers are completely dried, before the binding step.

It has been held by the Courts that to establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). The cited references of Mirous and Sage, individually or in combination, completely fail to teach the claimed limitations of independent claims 1 and 11.

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of dependent claims 2-9 and 12-18, it must be noted that the cited reference fail to disclose all the elements of independent claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, since the remaining dependent claims recite additional unique elements and/or limitations, these claims remain patentable.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-6 and 9-18 under Mirous in view of Sage be withdrawn, and the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 7 and 8 under Mirous in view of Sage and Jaffee be withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1-18.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Appl. No. 10/734,029  
Amdt. dated January \_\_\_, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of October 14, 2005

Please charge any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to  
Deposit Account No. 03-1250 (Ref. No. 12080001p036a).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 17, 2006

  
Aasheesh Shravah  
Reg. No.: 54,445

Sills Cummis Epstein & Gross P.C.  
One Riverfront Plaza  
Newark, New Jersey 07102-5400  
Telephone: (973) 643-7000